

Date: Mon, 20 Jun 94 04:30:15 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #272
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Mon, 20 Jun 94 Volume 94 : Issue 272

Today's Topics:

440 in So. Cal.
CW - THE GEEZER MODE!
Repeater Etquitte

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available (by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 20 Jun 1994 05:45:46 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!nic-nac.CSU.net!charnel.ecst.csuchico.edu!
yeshua.marcam.com!news.kei.com!ssd.intel.com!chnews!cmoore@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: 440 in So. Cal.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Dan Pickersgill (dan@amcomp.com) wrote:
: I can't see why you insist on using (open)
: that term (as it is very misleading and inaccurate). Dan N8PKV

Maybe it's because the ARRL repeater book uses it so much. Did you know that they list repeaters as either open or closed?

73, KG7BK, CecilMoore@delphi.com

Date: Mon, 20 Jun 1994 04:52:18 GMT
From: netcomsv!netcomsv!bongo!julian@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: CW - THE GEEZER MODE!

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <215.364.1442.0NA70318@megasystem.com> tim.marek@megasystem.com (Tim Marek) writes:

>I have been reading some of these messages regarding CW and "How out of
>touch it is" etc... Sorry folks.... NOT SO!

Geezer Alert!

Oh wow, another Morris is good for you flame war. You know, I have been missing these.

--

Julian Macassey, N6ARE julian@bongo.tele.com
Paper Mail: Apt 225, 975 Hancock Ave, West Hollywood, California 90069-4074

Date: 20 Jun 1994 00:31:06 -0400
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!news.umbc.edu!eff!
news.duke.edu!solaris.cc.vt.edu!news.ans.net!newstf01.cr1.aol.com!
search01.news.aol.com!not-for-mail@network.UCSD
Subject: Repeater Etquitte
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <ZE-yQun.edellers@delphi.com>, Ed Ellers
<edellers@delphi.com> writes:

> But I can still be cited by the FCC for not IDing!

Are you required to make sure your ID is repeated by the repeater, or are you merely required to transmit it.... and is there any requirement as to power?

It seems as if you could ID at 25 milliwatts and be legal...

Jose KD1SB

Date: Sun, 19 Jun 1994 10:53:00 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!math.ohio-state.edu!caen!malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!
amcomp!dan@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <RS60XZ6.edellers@delphi.com>, <061794225224Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>,
<Ry8xgmS.edellers@delphi.com>mp

Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com> writes:

>Dan Pickersgill <dan@amcomp.com> writes:

>

>>Guess what Ed, Part 97 DOES NOT!

>

>Dammit, I don't claim that it does! The fact that there is no difference in
>legal status between an "open" and a "closed" repeater doesn't mean that there
>is no difference in the real world.

>

>The FCC says that any repeater licensee CAN limit the use of his repeater to
>certain user stations. It does NOT say that he MUST.

Ed, you keep insisting to use the term 'open' on a policy forum. There is
no such thing as an open repeater. I seriously doubt that ANY trustee
would allow his repeater to be truly 'open'.

Since there is little difference between what you refer to as 'open' and
'closed', and NO leagle difference, I can't see why you insist on using
that ters (as it is very misleading and inaccurate).

Dan N8PKV

--

"Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price
of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what
course others may take, but as for me, GIVE ME LIBERTY, OR GIVE ME
DEATH!" -Patrick Henry, Virginia House of Burgesses on March 23,1775

Date: Sun, 19 Jun 1994 11:27:00 EST

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!math.ohio-state.edu!caen!malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!
amcomp!dan@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CrHppI.4DE@ra.nrl.navy.mil>, <061894033422Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>,
<1994Jun18.125802.43721@ucl.ac.uk>
Subject : Re: CW Argument...

zcapl34@ucl.ac.uk (Redvers Llewellyn Davies) writes:

>dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill) writes:

>

>>drumhell@claudette.nrl.navy.mil (David Drumheller) writes:

>

>>> Nevertheless, I could agree to slower code requirements. In fact, I

>>>could agree to the elimination of the Extra Class license entirely. Just
>>>give all the Extra Class privileges to the Advanced Class licensees, and
>>>turn all Extra Class licensees into Advanced Class licensees, or visa
>>>versa. Justification: Morse code is an antiquated mode. Even the Navy
>>>and Coast Guard have stopped teaching it to radiomen.

>

>>There is a HELL of an idea Move the "advanced class ops" to EXTRA rename
>>General to Advanced (It really isn't "General" anymore) and combine the
>>extra/advanced written (Improve it?). Eliminate the 20 WPM and keep the 13
>>or move it to 10.

>

>Hell to it! Why not just give Ham tickets to anyone who goes and asks for
>one, scrap the exam, scrap the morse. After all, who needs radio knowlage to
>use a "black-Box" radio nowadays?

I have repeatedly argued for better test and more through theory.

>*scarcistic mode off*

>

>Why not just do the code, you are only campagning for it to be scrapped 'cos
>people cannot be bothered. If you ain't willing to make the effort, then you
>shouldn't have the ticket. That simple.

Where the FUCK in my statement did you read ANYTHING about scrapping
testing. Or are you just looking for an arguement? FINE! We can argue. But
before you do, screw your head out of your ASS and READ WHAT I WROTE not
what you would argue against.

I am sick and tired of being misquoted and having words put in my mouth.
If you want to reply to what I said at least READ IT! I know it doesn't
BEEP at you so you have a real hard time understanding it, but that is NOT
what I said. NOR HAVE I EVER SAID IT! If you are too LAZY to read what
you are going to respond to then YOU SHOULD GET OFF USENET YOU DO NOT
BELONG HERE! If YOU are not willing to make the EFFORT to READ what I
SAID then how can you accuse ME of anything since you have no idea what
I was talking about. Or are you just too lazy to READ what doesn't BEEP
at you?

If you are so stupid that code is the only thing that you think makes an
amateur then I feel sorry for you, and YOUR version of amateur radio will
die out with no one at the funeral.

There are many people who CAN NOT learn the code. I know several. If you
can, fine. That does not make a you a ham, it MAY make you a post card
collector. That is not the purposes of the US Amateur Radio Service.

I run a weekly code practice on one of our 2-Meter repeaters and have
helped MANY hams develop their code proficiency. I have stated many times

in the past that I do not have a problem doing the code. However, the code is NOT relevant to an amateur radio licensee any more. Thus, it is not relevant to test for it.

Dan N8PKV

--
"Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take, but as for me, GIVE ME LIBERTY, OR GIVE ME DEATH!" -Patrick Henry, Virginia House of Burgesses on March 23, 1775

Date: Mon, 20 Jun 1994 06:02:45 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!kahuna!jeffrey@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <061894033422Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>, <1994Jun18.125802.43721@ucl.ac.uk>, <061994112715Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>,
Subject : Re: CW Argument...

>>>drumhell@claudette.nrl.navy.mil (David Drumheller) writes:
>>
>>> Morse code is an antiquated mode.

I've come to the conclusion that the people who keep coughing up the above remark spend more time on UseNet than on HF. Morse code, as used on the mode of CW, is used almost as much, and at certain times of the day, more so than any other mode. Proof? Listen for yourself.

And if radiotelegraph is 'antiquated' then so is radiotelephone - they're both just about the same age.

Jeff NH6IL jeffrey@math.hawaii.edu

Date: Sun, 19 Jun 1994 11:01:00 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!math.ohio-state.edu!caen!malgudi.oar.net!wariat.org!
amcomp!dan@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <BWyz4YE.edellers@delphi.com>, <061894032359Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>, <xTwKb.edellers@delphi.com>
Subject : Re: 440 in So. Cal.

Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com> writes:

>Dan Pickersgill <dan@amcomp.com> writes:
>
>>Where in part 97 does it grant access to all frequencies or bar anyone
>>from a specific frequency (outside the band plan and coded frequencies?
>
>Subpart D tells which bands, subbands and modes are available to each class;
>I can't find ANYTHING in Part 97 that allows someone (other than the FCC) to
>order me not to use a specific frequency that Part 97 otherwise authorizes me
>to use.

According to the FCC's interpretation of Part 97, that is not the case. The FCC has, as documented here previously, determined that the band plan is "good amateur practice" and thus required by part 97. Thus it IS the FCC, thru part 97 that is 'ordering' you. You can not take the rules one at a time. The rules are inclusive, including the interpretation the FCC places on the rules.

Previously you said that part 97.101 (b) allows you to operate any amateur frequency. That is not correct. The copy of part 97 that I have says;

97.101 (b) Each amateur licensee and each control operator MUST COOPERATE IN SELECTING TRANSMITTING CHANNELS and in making the most effective use of the amateur service. No frequency will be assigned for the EXCLUSIVE USE OF ANY STATION. (Emphs. added)

Now, where in there does it say that you can operate on any frequency? It does NOT. It says that no station shall have exclusive use of a frequency. It does NOT say that that any amateur can use any frequency. As above, it is not good amateur practice to not follow the band plan. You can not operate FM on 144.10, nor on 147.999. Likewise it is not good amateur practice to use 146.16 (a repeater input) as a simplex channel.

In interpreting the law (or FCC rules) you can not read into them what you would LIKE them to be. They are generally written as to reflect intent with as little doubt or need for interpretation. At least this is the general intent of the authors. Prohibiting the exclusive use to any station does NOT ENTITLE all stations to use. You can keep insisting that the sky is green, that will not make it so. Insisting that the above quoted part says that you can use any frequency you want, will not make it so. Cooperation, band plan and limiting access to our limited spectrum resources is required by Part 97.101 inclusive. An example specifically outlined in the rules would be a station with an emergency, they have priority and all stations must NOT use the frequency while such emergency is in progress. If two stations are using a frequency, do you have a "right" to use the frequency? I'll give you a hint, the answer is no.

Dan N8PKV

--
"Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price
of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what
course others may take, but as for me, GIVE ME LIBERTY, OR GIVE ME
DEATH!" -Patrick Henry, Virginia House of Burgesses on March 23,1775

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #272
